



**An American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848:
John C. Calhoun v. the Reformists and Revolutionaries**

**Travis Alan Moore
HST 499 Senior Seminar
Professor: Dr. Lowe**

**Read by
1st Reader: Dr. Doellinger
2nd Reader: Dr. Pettenger**

June 9th, 2006
Copywritten by Travis Alan Moore

In an age of fops and toys,
Wanting wisdom, void of right,
Who shall nerve heroic boys,
To hazard all in Freedom's fight.
Ralph Waldo Emerson²

Introduction:

Revolution. This elegant and devious word strikes fear and dread into every level of government. From presidents and monarchs to the simple senator or legislator everyone tiptoes around the sheer thought of it, the idea of it, but mostly the reality of it. That reality came into being in Europe in the early spring of 1848 just as winter's grip was ebbing from the European continent. The European revolutions of 1848-49 signaled a great change in the political world. The revolutions that swept across Europe brought to light the issues of freedom, democratic representation, equality, worker's rights, national rights, and the emancipation of persecuted peoples. The United States was the successful model of democratic freedoms in a world dominated by imperialistic power. It was only a matter of time until the movement of ideals and political reforms that began in America returned to Europe from across the Atlantic. This paper will examine the various American responses to the European revolutions and why they became important to the American social, cultural, and political landscape in 1848 and the years beyond.

The various American responses in many ways included political statements and laws, statements by governmental officials, works by famous authors and artisans, or rallies and gatherings by supportive citizens of the United States. Esteemed American scholar and political scientist, current Senator from South Carolina former Vice-president John C. Calhoun illustrated the level of discomfort in the United States political structure over the 1848 European revolutions and their relation to American predominance in the world. America followed the isolationist ideals set out in the Monroe Doctrine and struggled to keep itself separate from

¹ Eugene Delacroix, *Liberty Leading The People*. Painting. July 28 1830. On cover page.

² Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Best of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Essays, Poems, Addresses: Voluntaries*(1863). Edited by Walter Black , NY, 1941. Pg. 50.

European imperialism and interference. Revolutionaries fighting in Europe sought to change the political landscape in Hungary and Italy, Lajos Kossuth and Giuseppe Garibaldi both looked for aid in their struggles from the United States. And radicals in the literary sense, Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau directly challenged the American body politic on the issues of freedom and emancipation characterized by revolutions engulfing Europe.

Historiography:

In the year 1848 the European world was catapulted into a series of revolutions across the central European continent and would later be dubbed the 'Springtime of Nations.' This eclectic title signified the nationalization of the workers and peasant in certain areas of Europe. It was a time of mass revolutions, from one European state to another. In France, the Germany Confederation, Prussian empire, the Austrian empire, and in Italy the revolutionaries erected barricades in the streets. The rants of socialists, revolutionaries and first elements of a Marxist theory echoed violently across the continent. The empires of Europe were thrown into a period of chaos that lasted almost two years as new governments crafted by revolutionaries struggled to survive. The 1848-49 revolutions tore through Europe, an eruption of wildfires jumping from city to city and country to country, almost if the whole continent was burning. And in the end of the year 1849 all the European revolutions failed.

Meanwhile, the United States embarked on a new year in 1848, fresh from a victory in the Mexican-American War, and ecstatic over its triumphant military success. In the United States Senate, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and others returned from the winter recess, completing the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo just days before the transatlantic steamers brought the first news of the crises unfolding in Europe. The U.S., still considered a fledgling democratic nation, was a first in the world of empires and kingdoms; vigilantly she had to keep alert, guarding for the treachery or military interventions of Europe.

The elements of European dominance still could be felt in the United States as far away as the Oregon territory, divided with the British on the Canadian border. The American political scenery in 1848 was rife with action. President James Polk's administration and elements of Congress called to occupy the recently defeated Mexican countryside. The Yucatan Peninsula separated from Mexican control was also ripe for American or European intervention, and it seemed Cuba was appearing to pull away from the Spanish³. The world to Americans looked bleak, with enemies on every side and all of Europe seemed poised like hungry wolves, waiting to see where America's foreign policy under the Monroe Doctrine availed itself. The shock of the news of revolutions in Europe took America by the waistcoat, spinning its view from its own borders to the other side of the Atlantic. In the few weeks it took for the news of the revolutions that had begun in the late winter and early spring of 1848 to reach the U.S., much changed. Governments fell, barricades were built, and revolutionaries and imperial armies clashed violently in the streets. In Italy and Hungary the initial successes of the revolutionaries were incredible and dealt the controlling powers military defeats time and time again. By the end of the summer of 1849, the revolutions that engulfed a majority of Europe were all extinguished. Some in Hungary and Italy took the brief hiatus to regroup and launch new revolutions just years later in 1855-60. And ultimately France in the 1870 became a Republic, Germany and Prussia unified in 1867, Austria gave dual sovereignty to Hungary in 1867, and Italy drove out the Papal control and created for itself a new Kingdom of Italy in 1860.

Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann quotes, "There was a saying before 1848 that revolutions were made in France, that they were thought and theorized in Germany and that the situation in

³ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Edited by Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pg. 95.

England was characterized by fear of revolution and measures to prevent its possible outbreak.”⁴

A number of historians have delved deep into the tumultuous waters of this part of Europe’s past probing them from numerous angles. Scholars, politicians, and even the more common man all had a hand in some sort of actual response to these revolutions; especially to those in France, Hungary, and Italy. Historians such as Sir Lewis Namier, Jonathan Sperber, M.E. Barlen, and A.J.P. Taylor ⁵ focused on the aspects of the revolutions as they related to Europe and dismissed the residual effects on America, though evidence seemed to point to the contrary. Historians detailed reactions in specific countries and individual areas, noticing the nuances and affects these revolutions had within Europe but not from outside Europe. The scope of the research indicates that a vast majority of historians used to the European revolutions have omitted the reactions to the United States of America, if it was not pertaining to their research. A lot of what transpired in Europe was inadvertently connected to various effects within the United States. Other historians and political scientists have examined the European revolutions of 1848-1849 and note that they are actually well documented from a European standpoint but lack the fundamental reference to the burgeoning American empire of the nineteenth century. Therefore, Americans felt the reverberations of this ‘springtime of nations’ even across the vast ocean through the influx of new immigrants from Europe, political rhetoric and legislation, and the writings of Thoreau, Emerson, and others. There is a great amount of correlated evidence to indicate a number of American responses both positive and negative through documentation of the 1848 to the 1860s. These resources that include literature, lithographs, essays, music, and in book form all point to an area of research now only recently tapped. Furthermore, historians such

⁴ R. J. W. Evans, and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann, eds., *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Oxford, New York 2000. Pg. 1.

⁵ Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992. Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848 – 1851*, Cambridge University Press 1994. M.E. Barlen, *Foundations of Modern Europe: 1789-1871*. Frederick Unger Publishing, CO., New York, 1968. A.J.P. Talyor, *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy 1847-1849*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, U.K., 1934. 2nd edition 1970.

as Timothy M. Roberts, Frances L. Reinhold, Richard C. Rohr, and Larry Reynolds⁶ have been seeking to gain a strictly American focus on the relations of the struggles in European and the American responses.

Sir Lewis B. Namier, the most respected expert on the subject, analyzed those revolutions in exhaustive detail. In his book *1848: the Revolution of Intellectuals*, Namier fails to draw any reference or relation to the USA.⁷ One might also note that while Namier was more focused on how the revolutions began and their social constraints that caused their failures, than the American social and political reactions to those revolutions. Some of these social issues were wages, living conditions, but mostly freedom from persecution and free expression of ideas and political rhetoric contrary to the prevailing authoritarian rule. Namier relays the beginning of the revolutions to several factors mostly with the political activism of the university professors, students, thinkers, poets, and minor politicians all angry at their repeated attempts to bring necessary reforms to the French monarchy, the Hapsburg dynasty in Austria, and the Papal control in Italy.⁸ Jonathan Sperber later adds to that list the issues of economics, poor harvests, poor political representation of the workers, overwhelming poverty and dire living conditions, and angst within the working poor and landless nobles.⁹ Namier's research is that the intellectuals of Europe tried to emulate a political system of democracy akin to the American model through a popular revolution. In Namier's opinion the revolutions were only the creations of the intellectuals of Europe: students, professors, scorned politicians, poets, and writers and not

⁶ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1988. Timothy M. Roberts, *The American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848*. Oxford, NY, 1998. Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Edited by R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds. Oxford, New York 2000. Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Edited by Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Richard C. Rohrs, "American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848." *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Pgs 359-377.

⁷ Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992. Namier's book was examined thoroughly, but no evidence of a statement of the United States of America, America, American, USA, or even Yankee was discovered within it. While it is hard to believe such a revered expert left out a possibly important fact in history, it could be said that there was nothing to gain at the time from examining the issue of the revolutions from the American view.

⁸ *Ibid.* Pgs. 22-24.

⁹ Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848 – 1851*. Cambridge University Press 1994. Pgs. 10-12.

that of the workers and the poor who joined in after the revolutions began.¹⁰ Interestingly enough in France and Italy it was the workers and peasants that rallied to bring down the political system, the intellectuals at first are just bystanders, then participants, not just the sole actors as Namier dictates. Namier also states that one of the main reasons for the failure of the revolutions is due to the instability offered by the revolutionaries and their supporters.

Namier's essay *1848: Seed-plot of History*¹¹ asked some questions on the reasons why the revolutionaries arose. Namier in his previous book *Intellectuals* did not truly answer the questions from a philosophical view but more from a narrative. Calhoun would have summed it up as the nature of the revolutions as "anarchy and stupid folly."¹² It seems that Namier used this later essay to answer that hypothesis he posed in the book of why the revolutions of 1848 happened:

The revolution of 1848 followed on a period of intellectual efflorescence such as Europe has never known before or since; it supervened at a time when the Governments themselves came to feel unequal to the new circumstances and problems; in a period of financial crisis and economic distress, but of disjointed, or even contradictory, social movements.¹³

Namier's level of preeminence on the revolutions is noted by A.J.P Taylor, a student and colleague of Namier's in his own text on the Italian revolution of 1847-1849.¹⁴ While Namier's expertise is not in question since the revolutions of 1848-49 had a caused a greater effect than originally perceived, which was that the revolutions caused a moment of republican popular governments to flourish but also social changes that took hold and propelled new action by the people. Also it is interesting to point the *1848: Seed-point in History* essay is mostly due to the

¹⁰ Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992. Pg. 66.

¹¹ Lewis Namier, *1848: Seed-plot of History*. 1953. In *1848 A Turning Point?* Edited by Melvin Kranzberg. D. C. Heath and Company, Boston 1959. Pgs. 64-70.

¹² Charles M. Wiltse, "A Critical Southerner: John C. Calhoun on the Revolutions of 1848." *The Journal of Southern History*. Southern Historical Association, 1949. Pg 300.

¹³ Ibin. Pg. 65. The revolution of 1848 followed on a period of intellectual efflorescence such as Europe has never known before or since; it supervened at a time when the Governments themselves came to feel unequal to the new circumstances and problems; in a period of financial crisis and economic distress, but of disjointed, or even contradictory, social movements.

¹⁴ Talyor, A.J.P. *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy 1847-1849*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, U.K., 1934. 2nd edition 1970.

numerous questions left over from his *Intellectuals* book that evidently readers provided. However this becomes a dangerous track to follow since Namier seems to be speaking for all historians on this matter, and his authority tailored the answers that he addressed on the theories Namier saw fit to answer.¹⁵ And without addressing the plight of revolutionaries such as Garibaldi and Kossuth who were actively seeking American aid in support of their respective revolutions at the time of 1849-1852 merits a more than a cursory glance. Many treatises on the European revolutions of 1848¹⁶ are narrowly focused on just one country or on Europe as a whole. While this improves the distinct study of a group of people or a region of concern it stymies the pursuit of the overall picture and all of its relative inclusions that maybe needed for a historian or layman to truly explore the issue. In the end of all the revolutions no matter which way one examines them, failed. No matter the earlier successes in France, Germany, Italy or Hungary, as the people seemed at the cusp of a new age of European democracy. The failures also challenged Namier's own assertions that the intellectuals were the driving revolutionary force¹⁷ and Taylor's defense of the scholars and students propelling lasting change in 1848-49.¹⁸ For Namier's the failure also highlighted the issue of just one element of society trying to undertake a change for rest of society, and without that society's added support and assistance it will ultimately fail. For if the intellectuals did have that support then the social changes would have lasted beyond the collapse of the revolutions just a year later.¹⁹ Though in a way, later historians do show some elements of these social aims did survive the end of the revolutions.

¹⁵ Lewis Namier, *1848: Seed-plot of History*. 1953. In *1848 A Turning Point?* Edited Melvin Kranzberg D. C. Heath and Company, Boston 1959. Pgs. 64-70. Since Namier was considered the foremost authority on the issue of the European revolutions at the time his authenticity and hypothesis is considered *sans doute*. And furthermore, it gave Sir Lewis Namier, a new outlet to defend himself from his critics.

¹⁶ Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992. Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848 – 1851*, Cambridge University Press 1994. M.E. Barlen, *Foundations of Modern Europe: 1789-1871*. Frederick Unger Publishing CO., New York, 1968. A.J.P. Taylor, *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy 1847-1849*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, U.K., 1934. 2nd edition 1970

¹⁷ Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992. Pg. 105.

¹⁸ A.J.P. Talyor, *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy 1847-1849*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, U.K., 1934. 2nd edition 1970. Pgs. 83-91.

¹⁹ Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992. Pg. 108.

One being the Austrian empire, the German confederation and Prussia joined the emancipation of all slaves in imperial held territories by Britain and France after the revolutions.²⁰

Another characteristic of the 1848-49 revolutions was the lengths that the various militaries of Europe's imperial powers assisted each other in certain areas to stabilize those regions. Swiss, Prussian and French troops sought to put down the rebellion in Italy, while Austrian troops, backed by Prussian and Russian soldiers, suppressed the revolution in Hungary. Stradmann points out that this symbiotic relationship, while strained, has been a main characteristic that has affected Europe's relations and stability since the time of Charlemagne in the 8th century.²¹

Jonathan Sperber's *The European Revolutions, 1848-1851*²² is one of the few texts besides Roberts, Reynolds, Rohr, and Charles Wiltse that arguably points to American response to those various revolutions across the whole of Europe. Sperber draws a reference to the romanticized view as he dubs the "poetry of the barricades"²³ where historians have washed their narratives with the heroic deeds of certain figures and exalted their achievements almost on par with Homer. Another characteristic is the concept of the revolutions being a farce. Sperber defends this accusation by pointing to the actions of the revolutions themselves as looking their successes and failures individually and not lumped categorically together. The last characteristic Sperber alludes to be the perceived failures of the revolutions as a whole that many historians narrate to be.²⁴ Sperber points to several different cases using economics, census data, and a general repealing of certain laws like the German confederations emancipation of the Jewish citizens as somewhat social success and

²⁰ Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848 – 1851*. Cambridge University Press 1994. Pgs. 167-9

²¹ Ibid. Pg. 65.

²² Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848 – 1851*. Cambridge University Press 1994.

²³ Ibid. Pg. 2, 12-13

²⁴ Ibid. Pg.1-2

not failures of the revolutions.²⁵ All of these elements can also be seen in the number of sources from Calhoun, Henry Clay, and Thoreau as each characterizes each element of Sperber's revolutionary theory indicators. Sperber's makes the inference on the historians and their utilization of these revolutionary characterizations as their sole approach when documenting the various European revolutions in 1848-49.²⁶ Sperber reviewed the revolutions from a clinical perspective examining not only the historical and political issues but also the social, economic, military, political and religious factors that are all intertwined in the various European revolutions. All these factors play important parts in understanding the relevant causes and symptoms of the revolution and posed the understanding that these issues would resurface if not addressed and corrected possibly by other revolutions. This argument became true as Kossuth and Garibaldi both continue their revolutionary struggles in Hungary and Italy years later. Kossuth in 1867 is successful in helping divide the Austria-Hungary Empire and Garibaldi returns from the U.S. and wins the failed revolution in Italy. Garibaldi removed the Papal control and granted independence to all Italians under the new Kingdom of Italy in 1860. France also revolts again in 1869-70, and Otto von Bismarck unifies Germany by using some of the same arguments that the revolutionaries used in 1848 to bring their struggles justification.²⁷

Sperber later in his text combats in his argument, looking at the relative successes the revolutions generated and to which some of these successes, mostly small, lasted beyond the demise of the collective revolutions in Europe. Some of these successes were better lifestyles for the peasants and some minor freedoms, universal male suffrage in certain countries, better political representation, more self-management of crop production, and social freedoms

²⁵ Ibid. Pgs. 164, 184-9.

²⁶ Ibid. Pgs. 1-5. Sperber describes his topic and cautions the reader about the three typical levels of analysis to which most works on the subject have been applied.

²⁷ Ibid. Pgs. 187-8.

including emancipation and outlawing of slavery.²⁸ Other successes Sperber's notes is the aforementioned immigrations to the United States and the original openness of America borders and then later restrictions that are placed upon the number of immigrants allowed to come into the U.S.²⁹ While Sperber focuses on the revolutions, he does connect certain events to the U.S. and the inevitable reactions and responses that the Americans would have.

Roberts relates the 'Springtime of Nations' as a mirror image of European attempts at American democracy.³⁰ Arguably this may seem true, but it is also true that the number European nationals in New York City would be far more apt to advocate such reforms back home. Roberts argues that they would want such democratic freedoms to be present in both of their cultures, but maybe more on the lines of a constitutional monarchy, or republic.³¹ It would be hard to abandon loyalties to previous cultural norms and affinities to those cultures still proved to present in America where the immigrants lived. So it is important to investigate how they reacted and how the reaction played into their communities. Arguably Calhoun would have not disagreed with Roberts' assertions. Calhoun understood the dynamics and difficulties that existed from minorities in that day and age. This is due in part to the mentality of the southern slave states that struggled against their wealthier northern neighbors in representation in politics and equal footing in all matters of government policy. Calhoun believed it was "right and proper" for a common man to improve himself or his condition³², whether that was through a proper revolutionary government or by working within your own government system to benefit yourself and your family. However, one had to be aware that Calhoun considered "revolution" as an "unmixed evil" and something that should not be taken lightly without first addressing the

²⁸ Ibid. Pgs. 121-20, 163-4, 184-6.

²⁹ Ibid. Pgs. 61-4.

³⁰ Timothy M. Roberts, *The American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848*. Oxford, NY, 1998. Pages 67-72

³¹ Ibid. pg. 72

³² Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pg. 341

factors that compliment or complicate the legality of the revolution.³³ A foremost concern of Calhoun's is on that the type of government that to be overthrown and most importantly what are the 'ends' that the revolutionary would take in pursuit of that goal.³⁴ Roberts puts in a curious phrase when describing Europe's revolutionary craze, he calls it a "yearning" for democracy.³⁵ What is important to discover is the valuable insights that historians can gain in looking at the 1848 European revolutions in a different light. Chiefly, from the standpoint of the U.S. government and the American people. The European revolutions tested the United States on several issues, namely slavery, immigration reform, and most of all America's Isolationist policy enacted by the Monroe Doctrine.

American Political Responses

Richard Rohr's *American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848* calls the America responses "euphoric"³⁶ when concerning the news from France in the spring of 1848. This partially due to the vast majority of Americans who perceived the revolution to be an end of the arbitrary rule of King Louis Philippe that would trigger a shift in world politics to favor republicanism. But a minority of U.S. government officials, mostly Whigs and some Democrats, were hesitant to embrace the new revolutionary France republic. Senator Calhoun of the thirteenth Congress stressed "grave concerns" in his private correspondence³⁷ and publicly sought a distancing of American political support for the revolution.³⁸ Other Whigs and some Democrats were also very vocal about delaying or even holding back altogether any

³³ Charles M. Wiltse, "A Critical Southerner: John C. Calhoun on the Revolutions of 1848." *The Journal of Southern History*. Southern Historical Association, 1949. Pg 303.

³⁴ *Ibid.* Pg. 303.

³⁵ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pg. 77. Roberts notes, "In 1848 Europe showed a new aspect; a yearning to change dramatically, to declare, if not secure, popular sovereignty....was it possible that Europe was imitating or even surpassing , the USA in developing liberal democracy?"

³⁶ Richard C. Rohrs, "American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848." *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Rohrs notes the sense of kinship and connection between America and France previously to 1848.

³⁷ *Ibid.* Pgs. 363

³⁸ *Ibid.* Pgs 363-65.

congratulations to the French pronouncement of their 1848 revolution's triumph.³⁹ Calhoun was not as eager as his democratic rivals: Clay, Webster, Minister Richard Rush⁴⁰, President James K. Polk, and Vice President George M. Dallas. Calhoun argued that the United States should continue to adhere to the isolationist policies of the Monroe Doctrine.

Minister Rush admittedly was concerned with the possibility of the French Provisional government's success since the "fighting, bloodshed, dismay...and wild disorganization" distressed him⁴¹ but it did not deter him to, on his own authority, recognize the new French Provisional government only five days after it overthrew King Louis Philippe. The 1842 Webster-Ashburton treaty⁴² between U.S. and Britain guaranteed the extradition of Canadian revolutionaries was still fresh in Calhoun's mind.⁴³ That treaty over the next part of the decade was offered to a number of European powers in securing revolutionaries who fled to the U.S. However it was not utilized in trying to apprehend the revolutionaries Garibaldi or Kossuth when they visited U.S. in the early 1850s. The Use of the Webster-Ashburton treaty was used to secure an open dialogue and a level of interstate diplomacy between the U.S. and the empires of Europe. This treaty became disregarded during the 1848 revolutions mostly due to the apparent successes of the revolutionaries in Europe deposing the legitimate governments and completely forgotten by the 1850s.

Calhoun expressed a very serious concern over the revolutions in France; he doubted the veracity over the legitimacy of any government that used "the right and will of the majority to

³⁹ Ibid. Pgs.365-368. Whigs in the U.S. Senate such as Andrew P. Butler, SC; Giuseppe R Underwood, KY; William L. Dayton, NJ; and Samuel Phelps, VT.

⁴⁰ Richard C. Rohrs, "American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848." *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Pg. 362. Richard. Rush, *Occasional Productions, Political, Diplomatic, and Miscellaneous. Including , Among others, a glance at the court and Government of Louis Philippe and the French Revolution of 1848*. Philadelphia, PA, 1874. Pgs. 437-48. The American Minister to France Richard Rush noted that the "Revolution came like a thunderclap" and extended diplomatic recognition to the new revolutionary French Provisional Government five days after the start of the revolution overthrew King Louis.

⁴¹ Ibid. Pg. 362.

⁴² Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 67.

⁴³ Ibid. Pg. 67. Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pgs. 291-2.

overturn law and constitution at its will and pleasure”.⁴⁴ To Calhoun the rights of the minority in France were willfully crushed by the overpowering majority, to which he preordained an imminent parallel for the southern American States. This recurring argument in Calhoun’s speeches, journals, and letters points to Calhoun’s reluctance to go so far as extending wide welcoming arms to the revolutionaries as Polk and Rush had done. Calhoun’s preoccupation with defending the rights of South Carolinians, indeed the whole of the South, from the oppressive Northern states and the abolitionists became a central theme that he assigned to the 1848 revolutions in French and to the rest of Europe.⁴⁵ In *Disquisition on Government*, a political science paper published after Calhoun’s death in 1852, he placed a basic metaphor that government is so essential to mankind as “breathing” and the application of it is one of basic human “necessity”.⁴⁶ The question of “equality, liberty, fraternity”⁴⁷ being applied in political practices and with its integration to all sectors of its citizens would be catastrophic. Since France recently emancipated all of its slaves under King Louis Phillipe, Calhoun a southern slaveholder saw this new French republic as a wedge to break America on the issue of slavery.⁴⁸ Calhoun’s adamant refusal of congratulations of the newly free people of French (actually the second time within 60 years), his staunch opposition to it draws straight references to his opposition to abolishing slavery. “France is not prepared to become a Republic[sic]”⁴⁹ Calhoun inscribes in a warning to his daughter Anna in Belgium just after word arrives from Rush about the French abdication of King Louis. Earlier, when pressed upon the matter of *Le Amistad v. United States*

⁴⁴ Richard C. Rohrs, “American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848.” *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Pgs. 363-4. Calhoun to Mrs. Thomas Clemson, Apr. 28, 1848. (Personal correspondence)

⁴⁵ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pgs. 285-6

⁴⁶ John M. Anderson, ed., *Calhoun: Basic Documents: Disquisition on Government* (1851). Bald Eagle Press, PA, 1952. Pg. 33. There is no difficulty in forming a government. It is not even a matter of choice, whether there shall be one or not. Like breathing, it is not permitted to depend on our volition. Necessity will force it on all communities in some form or another.

⁴⁷ Richard C. Rohrs, “American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848.” *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Pg. 363.

⁴⁸ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pgs. 283-312.

⁴⁹ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pg. 338. Calhoun letters to Mrs. Anna Calhoun Clemeson March 22, 1848.

of America, Calhoun expressed that the North are “the masters and we the slaves”⁵⁰ and opposed the decisions of the lower courts which had sided with the slaves in their insurrection over their Spanish masters.

Senator Samuel Phelps of Vermont, a fellow Whig tried to propose a delay upon the Ohio Democratic Senator William Allen’s resolution that offered congratulations to the new French government. Phelps tried to offer a cautious tone to Calhoun’s refusal in stating that the concern of the American Government is on where the “wheel of revolution begins to revolve, who can...tell where it will stop”.⁵¹ Other Whigs also noted that previous French attempts at revolution had failed. Calhoun held his support for any such acknowledgement or applause for the French revolution not only due to nefarious actions of the revolutionaries but also on the certainty that he shared with Phelps on the inevitable failure of the French Revolution. Calhoun pessimistically stated that the French revolution would be over by May and would end in the same result as the last republic “in a imperial government”.⁵² Calhoun’s daughter, while safety married to an American Minister, still lived in Belgium and Calhoun hoped the violence of the French revolution would stay localized there in France, but worried about its spread to neighboring countries. He had higher hopes for Germany Confederation and Prussia that reported their revolutions; furthermore, the German revolutions were nonviolent and more civilized as it had checks and balances to control radical extremists.⁵³ One of the reasons possibly for Calhoun and Phelps’s irritation at the French revolutionaries was because of France’s previously failed democratic government from 1789, which was crushed by Napoleon

⁵⁰ *Amistad*. Directed by Steven Spielsburg. 1 hour and 48 minutes. Produced by Dreamworks, CA, 1997. *Le Amistad v. United States of America*. 40.US.518.1841. An important U.S. Supreme Court case concerning the application and validation of U.S. and Foreign treaties which was characterized by the adaptation of the case it into a movie format directed by Steven Spielsberg. Except of Calhoun’s statements taken from *Speech on the reception of Abolition Petitions*. Calhoun, Brooker T. *Speech on the reception of Abolition Petitions John C. Calhoun*. Essential Speeches, Great Neck Publishing, 2003. Speech 9.0.

⁵¹ Richard C. Rohrs, “American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848.” *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Pg. 364.

⁵² Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pg. 340.

⁵³ *Ibid*. Pg 340.

just a few years later. Calhoun had no love for monarchs and emperors, seeing them as just tyrants and destined to draw the ire of their people.⁵⁴ The two U.S. statesmen had been down this track before with France and were very cautious of looking too much into the situation for a sort of moral victory for democracy until France could prove its stability.

The floor of the U.S. Congress became more heated with elected officials relating their feelings on the revolutions. Even President Polk on the 22nd of April 1848, sent a supportive message to Congress declaring:

The world has seldom witnessed a more interesting spectacle than the peaceful rising of the French people, resolved to secure themselves enlarged liberty, and to assert, in the majesty of their strength, the great truth, that, in this enlightened age, man is capable of governing himself.
55

The Allen resolution passed the House on April 23rd and then was debated in the Senate, drawing some immediate criticism mostly from Calhoun, Phelps and a few others. The United States began to show support for the French revolutionaries from the Senate Chamber floor including on the 24th of April 1848, when Vice President George M. Dallas calls for an official celebration for the new democracy in France. The journal of the Senate captures this in its annuals:

The Vice President George M. Dallas laid before the Senate a communication from the executive committee of a general meeting of the citizens of Washington, inviting the Senate and its presiding officer to join in the celebration, arranged for this day, of the recent French revolution, and the other republican movements in Europe.⁵⁶

President Polk and other leading members of the U.S. government were eager to put a positive spin on the revolutions especially in France; however, that began to sour in the later part of 1849 when the revolution failed and a French monarchy was reestablished.

⁵⁴ Ibid. Pgs. 125-9.

⁵⁵ Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*. Pg. 11. *Stryker's American Quarterly Register and Magazine*. September 1848. Presidential Polk's address to Congress states, "the world has seldom witnessed a more interesting spectacle than the peaceful rising of the French people, resolved to secure themselves enlarged liberty, and to assert, in the majesty of their strength, the great truth, that, in this enlightened age, man is capable of governing himself." This announcement was later documented in the *Stryker's American Quarterly Register and Magazine* which is published every four months with the European Revolutions of 1848 first being mentioned in the September issue of that same year.

⁵⁶ U.S. Congress. Journal of the Senate of the United States of America: 1789-1873. April 24, 1848.

The American political responses were obvious in respects even outside Calhoun's own speeches. One of the political parties of the day, the Whigs, penned an editorial in their monthly review. While it was well after the start of the revolutions it is a significant source that clearly identifies an American response, albeit a political one in Washington. It was an attack on M. Louis Blanc, a member of the new French Provisional government. The revolutionaries set up this new government in their apparent success in France after the ouster of King Louis. The editorial piece by the American Whig Review blasts the French provisional government:

That a revolution of only three days sufficed to place Louis Philippe on the throne, was no proof of the unanimity of the French nation: nor was the state of the parties at his accession such as to warrant a belief in the stability of his government, he was indebted for his elevation to the trading and middle classes, which comprised men of all political parties, to whose prosperity internal tranquility is indispensable, from whose pockets are principally extracted the expenses of war, and to whom revolution is almost certain ruin.⁵⁷

And to revolutionaries that it labels them as hateful "partisans."⁵⁸ It continues to validate the monarchy of France as the legitimate government and illustrates some of the opposition in the American Congress to the revolutions. The Whigs, who were a prevailing American political party, were set against the restoration of a French republic with unanimous public support that they felt the revolutionaries did not acquire. This congressional article directly shows an American response by the political spectrum of Washington in the federal government and it was most likely reiterated in local and state governments as well.

In *Covenant and Civil Society* authored by Daniel Elazar, Elazar describes some interesting parallels with France and America.⁵⁹ While examining the roles of governments and peoples, Elazar looks at perilous factors that governments face when they break or hold to the

⁵⁷ Henry Smales, "French Revolution: M. Louis Blanc." *American Whig Review*. Volume 8, Issue 1, July 1848. Pgs. 90-100. This review is dealing also primarily with M. Louis Blanc's two volume work, *The history of Ten Years, or France under Louis Phillippe*, which he wrote in 1848 and was published in Philadelphia. Excerpt from Pg. 91.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* page 90 – 100. There are several instances where the term 'partisan' occur.

⁵⁹ Daniel Judah Elazar, *Covenant and Civil Society: the Constitutional Matrix of a Modern Democracy*. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction, c1998.Pg.164.

covenant they make with their populace. He highlights cooperative, collectivist, and coercive parallels between France and the U.S. in the end of the twentieth century. But his insight and theory play true also towards understanding the American government's view of the revolutions in France in 1848-49.⁶⁰ At the height of the revolutions America stuck to her more isolationist policies by having Europe solve European problems. This goes directly back to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 and the concept of the Manifest destiny that pervaded American foreign policies until the outbreak of World War I. Calhoun, an avid supporter of the Monroe Doctrine, espoused its virtues especially when it concerned the emancipation of French and British slaves in the Caribbean. The collusion of the two dominant world empires seemed like a blow to the South's interest of maintaining some sort of equal footing with its Northern neighbors. Added to that is the outlawing of slavery in their respective empires, the rest of Europe followed suit with Britain and France. Without the ability to import new slave stock from outside the United States, via the Caribbean, the South had to rely on a labor pool that kept trying to be liberated by Northern abolitionists.⁶¹

Unfortunately, while Elazar's theory mainly explains much in the way of inter-governmental relations and comparative models, it does not give an image of that as a concern or political theory in Washington at the time. Elazar's work, while being highly informative, gives slight insight on the historic theory of the American response even from the foremost authority of American politics of the period: James C. Calhoun. Elazar gives credit to the Jacobin system that France benefited from and compares that to the success of the American federal

⁶⁰ Ibid. Pg. 170. "Every one of the countries in continental Europe underwent some kind of violent wrenching experiences during the modern epoch... All of these violent wrenchings has their avowed purpose at the very least the replacement of autocracy or absolute monarchy by republicanism or even democratic republicanism, although at the very end most of the victims of counterrevolutions that brought equal or worse wrenchings."

⁶¹ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pg. 156. The importing of slaves from Africa was illegal inside the United States since 1808 by Congressional Order.

system.⁶² He also delves into the federalist ideology and how it reacts to revolutions, while not focusing completely on the United States and the European revolutions.

The aforementioned President Polk and the *Whig Review* made some of the political responses of the day, but other articles and texts illustrate the growing responses emanating inside Washington. One is by Peter Amann who brings to light the diplomatic relations with the standing government of France and the United States was beginning to become strained. He notes, “[t]he rather peripheral relations of France and the United States have received some attention.”⁶³ Little contact existed between the two countries during those years of revolution especially after the “recall of the old French Minister to Washington over personality conflicts, colonial rivalries in Hawaii and obscure troubles in the Caribbean.”⁶⁴ Even in 1849 the American political response was being addressed towards the revolution’s outcomes. Senator Henry Stuart Foote put forth a resolution to cut diplomatic ties with Austria over the failed Hungarian revolution in August 1849 and Austria’s treatment of captured Hungarian freedom fighters.⁶⁵ And also there is Secretary of State James Buchanan, who instructed the newly appointed U.S. Minister to Rome, Lewis Cass Jr., to withhold diplomatic recognition to Giuseppe Mazzini’s revolutionary Italian republic.⁶⁶ Ironically in 1861 after Garibaldi’s successful revolution, the new U.S. Secretary of State, William H Seward, wished “that the extended will of His Majesty, so entirely in accordance of the Italian people.”⁶⁷ A complete roundabout from an earlier American standpoint even though the same revolutionaries involved in the first revolution were responsible for the successful second attempt.

⁶² Ibid. Page 172. “The French revolution of 1784 may have been the most successful other than the American. Its ideas, especially in the Jacobin form, certainly superseded American political thought for most of the world, for some 200 years... It became a leading democratic rival to American federal democracy.”

⁶³ Peter. H. Amann, “Writings of the Second French Republic.” *Journal of Modern History*. Vol. 34, No. 4, December 1962. Pgs. 428

⁶⁴ Ibid. Pg. 428.

⁶⁵ Endre Sebestyen, *Kossuth: a Magyar Apostle of World Democracy*. Pittsburgh, PA, 1950. Pg. 78.

⁶⁶ Paola Gemme, *Domesticating Foreign Struggles: the Italian Risorgimento and antebellum American identity*. University of Georgia, GA, 2005. Pg. 51.

⁶⁷ Ibid. Pg. 51.

Kossuth criticizes President Milton Fillmore's isolationist policies in late 1851, trying to provoke the U.S. into some sort of action. "Beware your loneliness" Kossuth warns alerting the U.S. that if she stays out of the fight for too long then only she will be left to fight against the tides of tyranny.⁶⁸ Senator Clay, a longtime friend and adversary of Calhoun's, reiterated America's isolationist policy as a policy of "prosperity" and "happiness."⁶⁹ Furthermore, Clay warns that if America becomes involved in "the tangled web of European politics" then America could doom Hungary and her virtuous struggles would be for naught.⁷⁰ Clay ends his defense of the American isolationist foreign policies with the understanding that this intervention that Kossuth wants would actually endanger the U.S. ability to help outside conflicts by taking in refugees and exiled revolutionaries, even from Hungary. Clay sums up with:

Far better it is for ourselves, for Hungary, and for the cause of liberty, that, adhering to our wise pacific system, and avoiding the distant wars of Europe, we should keep our lamp burning brightly on this western shore, as a light to all nations, than to hazard its utter extinction, amid the ruins of fallen or falling republics.⁷¹

Calhoun, save for his death in June 1851, would have, like other southern slave owners, viewed Kossuth suspiciously since Kossuth leaned on the fence, flirting with the attentions of both abolitionists and slave owners.⁷² This duplicity did not endear him great support and near the end of 1852, started to gain Kossuth animosity from both sides. The real blow to Kossuth's chances for American aid was the death of Daniel Webster, who was the U.S. Secretary of State under President Fillmore's administration (1850-1852). Webster was a staunch supporter of the Magyar's revolutionary aspirations and was one of the principal reasons that Kossuth enjoyed

⁶⁸ Endre Sebastyen, *Kossuth: a Magyar Apostle of World Democracy*. Pg. 83. Speech in Louisville, KY: "Once more, I repeat: a timely pronouncement of the united States would avert a second interference of Russia. She must sharpen the fangs of her bear, and get a host of other beasts into her menagerie, before she will provoke the eagle of America. But beware, beware of your loneliness! If you protest be delayed long, you will have to fight alone against the world, while now, you only have to watch, and others will fight."

⁶⁹ Ibid. Pg. 82.

⁷⁰ Ibid. Pg. 82.

⁷¹ Ibid. Pg. 82.

⁷² Ibid. Pg. 83-4.

such a warm welcome in the United States for over a year.⁷³ Future President James Buchanan, and a proslavery advocate, organized a dinner party at the United States Consul in London in late February of 1854. Around the table sat his invited guests, revolutionaries every one of them: chiefly Mazzini, Kossuth, Garibaldi, and host of others.⁷⁴ Buchanan praised the assembled revolutionaries and informed them of the sympathies of the American people are with them in their struggles.

Other political responses came in the form of the realm of diplomacy. John Gallagher relates that the United States utilized this occurrence, the revolution in France, as a test case to perfect its diplomatic services and increase the professionalism of the U.S. State Department.⁷⁵ Several issues and internal problems plagued the U.S. diplomatic corps, as the art of diplomacy was still relatively new for the U.S. A problem that arose actually came from a revolutionary refugee who fled the failed revolutions in France in 1859. Reinhold notes this in her work referring to French born Pierre Soule and his Ostend Manifesto⁷⁶ penned five years after the revolutions had passed into history. This manifesto became an embarrassment for the State department as it drifted drastically away from the tenets of the Monroe Doctrine and called for open cooperation with certain European countries over the issue of Cuba.⁷⁷

One of most subtle political responses of the American government is actually negative as it relates to the revolutionaries. This fascinating note is that the United States Navy had assisted the Prussian Imperial Navy in 1848, in training and production of a new warship during

⁷³ Ibid. Pgs 63-88.

⁷⁴ Jasper Ridley, *Garibaldi*. Constable, London, 1974. Pg. 377.

⁷⁵ John G. Gallaher, *An Evaluation of the Revolution of 1848 by American Diplomats*, St. Louis University press, St. Louis, 1961. (Ph.D. dissertation)

⁷⁶ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 68. "The State department was greatly embarrassed by the much discredited Ostend Manifesto of 1853, the work of an 1848 French refugee, Pierre Soule who had risen to the highest diplomatic rank in this country's career service."

⁷⁷ Ibid. Pg. 68. The Ostend Manifesto was directly tied to a possible joint alliance of Britain, France, and the U.S. against Spain, who attended a diplomatic meeting in Ostend, Belgium in 1854, over the issue of Cuba. The U.S. warned Spain that if it does not sell it Cuba then the Monroe Doctrine gives the U.S. the authority to simply take it from Spain by force. This blatant reinterpretation of American foreign policy did not go over well with the U.S. Secretary of State Buchanan, who then fired Minister Soule for his mishandling of the issue.

the revolutions. Roberts details that this military assistance and President Polk's dispatching the *U.S.S St. Lawrence* in that May of 1848, may have been a result of the U.S. government's silent involvement with the Germans and Prussians in quelling those revolutions.⁷⁸

The political responses coming from the United States' premier statesmen, presidents and diplomats, danced about the issue of upholding the Monroe Doctrine. This staple of American foreign policy began to be tested in ways not previously thought of. The U.S. previously believed that could be influenced into action by events not in its own hemisphere of control if it just remained idle and wary. This reinterpretation of the Monroe Doctrine became imperative as the new factors of the European revolutions tested the Americans tenacity to stay isolated and let Europe resolve to take care of itself. As it's pointed out in earlier political responses, the ideals of isolationism and the practice of it came into sharp contrasts in the 1848-60 time periods. Coupled with that dilemma was the compounded issue of slavery in America, and the power disparity between the Southern and Northern states each galvanized in their determination on both sides of the issue. And in addition to that, the influx of refugees streaming from the continent became so great it threatened to swamp the Americans ability to cope with it.

Immigration

Congress seemed puzzled for answers on dealing with the deluge of new immigrants to the eastern seaboard: New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and Boston. Timothy Hatton relates that the numbers of the 50 million Europeans that emigrated out of Europe in the time after 1820s till the 1920s up to 60% or 30 million arrived in the United States during the middle (1850-1880) of that one hundred year span.⁷⁹ In the beginning of this mass exodus the numbers of European immigrants were of mostly British and German descent and the various ethnicities

⁷⁸ Ibid. Pgs. 77-78. Roberts' analyzes this factual evidence and draws upon the American military might that swelled slightly after the war with Mexico.

⁷⁹ Timothy J. Hatton, and Jeffery G. Williamson. 1998. *International Migration 1850-1939: An Economic Survey*. In *Historical Foundations of Globalization*, by James Foreman-Peck, ed. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edgar Reference Collection. Excepted from *History Derailed: Central and Eastern European in the Long Nineteenth Century*. By Ivan T. Berend, ed. University of California Press, Berkley, CA, 2003. Pg. 219-220.

associated to those two countries. Shortly after 1850 and then until 1920 those immigrating to the United States began to include a number of European nationalities affected by the revolutions: Austrians, French, Hungarians, Prussians, Polish, Sicilians, Spanish, Swiss, and Romanians.

America was the dumping ground of Europe's indigent, oppressed, and huddled masses. It was a melting pot of European citizens who longed and struggled for a better life. Calhoun himself was the son of immigrants who arrived in the mid seventeenth century making South Carolina their new home. The immigrants came from all across the shores of the European continent and even from parts of Asia Minor. Frances L. Reinhold notes the "asylum of the oppressed"⁸⁰ and she identifies the elements of the mass migrations from Europe to America. In Reinhold's depiction of the early U.S. immigration policy was fraught with years of open and unfettered immigration from the continent from 1820s till 1846, then after the revolutions in 1850 till the end of the century America again opened her doors to immigrants.⁸¹ Masses of Europeans from numerous countries settled in the United States. Reinhold again draws the attention to this when mentioning the mass German migration shortly after the German revolution of 1848-49 and the social upheaval in Prussia and the German confederation.⁸² The European immigrants barely had anything in common; moreover, they could barely even communicate to each other or to the Americans they had journeyed so far to join. Needless to say there was one thing that all the immigrants did have in a common, whether they were recent arrivals or had been American for a few generations. That commonality was that remembrance and attachment to their homelands in Europe.

⁸⁰ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 66. "[W]ithin the 'asylum of the oppressed' a new England, a new Germany, a new Ireland, a new Israel, and a new Italy were reared on the eastern seaboard."

⁸¹ *Ibid.* Pg. 65.

⁸² *Ibid.* Pg. 64. "During the nineteenth century our littoral was inundated with a tidal wave of German refugees as a result of the socialist upheaval of 1848."

Reinhold later points out again referring to a “transposed Ireland”⁸³ illustrating the ongoing exodus from Emerald Isle; nevertheless, Reinhold indicates that this exodus is characteristic in all parts of Europe. Also that attachment to one’s homeland and previous culture was a characteristic seen everywhere an immigrant settled. In the period of 1840s till the end of the century the landscape across America had whole cultures establishing themselves, resembling mirrored communities of the countries they originated from. Whether those European immigrants lived in Jewish, Russian, Polish, Irish or Italian localized ‘city-states’ or Burroughs in metropolitan cities like New York, Philadelphia, Boston or even far across the newly secured United States to San Francisco or even Portland in the Oregon Territory. All of these cities, new and old became bastions for the numerous throngs of impoverished masses to which in turn Reinhold notes that these areas or locales became import conduits for those ‘new’ Americans and their respective homelands in the old country.⁸⁴ These new ‘Americans’ celebrated the new of the revolutions of Europe gathering and toasting what they thought was a new Europe, happy for their friends and family in Europe. These immigrants also including the ‘48’er’s from Germany that settled in St. Louis and other American cities became responsible in organizing rallies, riots, and strikes in 1862 in St. Louis protesting wages and other social issues.⁸⁵ Other immigrants from Europe especially the regions affected by the revolutions began to flee to America for a better life. President Zachary Taylor relaxed the immigration policies against these areas of Europe, including the 1842 Webster-Ashburton treaty, and allowed for dissidents, the impoverished, and the unwanted swarms of Europe to reach America’s shores.⁸⁶ Taylor on January 12th, 1950 signed legislation paving the way for numerous Magyar refugees and allowed

⁸³ Ibid. Pg. 67.

⁸⁴ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 71.

⁸⁵ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Edited by Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pg. 148.

⁸⁶ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 72.

them to safely immigrate to the U.S., including Kossuth.⁸⁷ A number of the Hungarian and Italian revolutionaries fled to the United States to avoid imprisonment in 1850-51. A fascinating element of a response since a few thousand Irishmen joined the Union Army during the Civil War with the promise of employment and benefits to their families if they happen to be killed.⁸⁸ Something they would not have received back in Ireland or elsewhere in Europe. Some of the affects that influx of immigrants had on U.S. became apparent in legislation that was passed after 1848-49 when the revolutions ended but the immigrants still came.

Laws and Acts

One of the last major noticeable political responses that transpired after the revolutions in Europe failed was some legislation that had some visible ties to those failed revolutions and more importantly to the immigration that followed. In the immediate years after the revolutions the Fugitive Slave Act was passed in 1850. It was crafted to address the rights of slave owners and escaped slaves as they tried to escape in to the safety of the Northern states where slavery was banned. Abolitionists countered against this law, seizing upon imagery of the day in 1850 and paralleled the plight of the runaway slaves to that of Hungarian freedom fighters in Austrian controlled lands.⁸⁹ Calhoun being the main advocate for pro-slavery movement and an architect for the Nebraska-Kansas act of 1854 before his death in 1852 protested such comparisons, in personal letters and public speeches.⁹⁰ The later Nebraska-Kansas Act in 1854 recreated America into a divided state, not only with the ideologies of the North and South, but now the added also a physical division of the country, pulled Americans further away from a resolution to the issue of slavery and closer to the

⁸⁷ Endre Sebestyen, *Kossuth: a Magyar Apostle of World Democracy*. Pittsburgh, PA, 1950. Pg. 65

⁸⁸ Ibid. Pg. 70.

⁸⁹ Ibid. Pg. 139. excerpted from Donald Spencer, *Lajos Kossuth and Young America*. Columbia, MO, 1977. Roberts notes, “[A]fter passage of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850, requiring the national government to help recapture runaway slaves, the antislavery press described episodes of slaves’ flight and apprehension in terms of Hungarian freedom- fighters succumbing to Austrian oppression. Land reform in the western United States in part stemmed from pressure brought by immigrant and native laborers who used revolutionary Europe as a foil.

⁹⁰ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pg. 156

looming threat of civil war. While the passage of Fugitive Slave Act and Nebraska-Kansas Act may not coincide directly with the 1848-49 revolutions, their timely appearance so soon after it bears further attention. The idea that America could not be unduly influenced from ideas across the ocean was not uncommon.

It can also be reasoned that this surplus of new American citizenry had a direct political result, albeit fifteen years later. The Homestead Act of 1863 Reinhold believes is that result which can be tied specifically to the 1848-49 revolutions. Reinhold notes that the refugees of European countries were used to populate the vast tracks of American frontier land; hence, the new immigrants played a tremendous part. Reinhold writes, "Provision of cheap lands to Hungarian exiles after 1848 is reputed to have developed into the Homestead Act of 1863 by which policy our western and eastern frontiers were eventually merged."⁹¹ These pieces of legislation not only impacted the immigrants but the millions of Americans free and enslaved already in the United States in the decade after 1848-49. The surplus of immigrants in the Northern states taxed regional support services and created a vast pool of unwanted and unemployed poor eager to find that image of American prosperity. Authors and literary icons Henry David Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson also weighed into the political arena and address their thoughts of the European revolutions of 1848 on the American and world stages.

American Cultural Responses

With the supportive and caustic responses to the European revolutions from Congress and the three sitting Presidents during the revolutions years, did not just sum up the American reactions to Europe in 1848 to 1860. Historians such as Roberts, Rohr, Reinhold, and Larry

⁹¹ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 68.

Reynolds have been trying to gain an American focus that there has been documented proof of an American response to the revolutions. In *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*, Reynolds in his own preface boldly states, “This book is about the influence of the European revolutions of 1848-49 upon American literature of the mid-nineteenth century.”⁹² He continues on calling this a period of American literary renaissance.⁹³ This renaissance refers to the resurgence of poets, lyricists, and writers of all backgrounds to expand their current realms of thought and skills. Reynolds documents a speech by Henry David Thoreau in January 1848, a scant month before France begins its revolutionary craze. Thoreau’s speech which included elements that later were contained in this essay *Civil Disobedience* the important elements of man, and man’s natural desire to be free from governmental restrictions and arbitrary oppressive rule. Thoreau eloquently states that “all men recognize the need of revolution’ especially in the face of tyranny.”⁹⁴ Thoreau attempted to stay out of the revolutionary spectacle that swept Europe and threatened to spill into America, but like other abolitionists he found himself drawn into the parallels of the revolution and slavery. Thoreau became embroiled with Calhoun in a bitter dispute over slavery and the freedoms that government should offer all people.⁹⁵

Roberts adds some interesting contributions as he details three plays that preformed in the honor of the French revolution; one before and two after the June barricade incident.⁹⁶

Calhoun would contest with Thoreau’s abolitionist disposition that all men deserve the right

⁹² Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1988. Pg. xi.

⁹³ *Ibid.* Pg. xi.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* Pg. 1. Taken from Henry David Thoreau’s *Reform Papers*, ed. Wendell Glick. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973. Pg. 67. From a speech delivered at the Concord Lyceum on January 26, 1848 Just during the start of the French Revolution. Later this is comprised in his essay *Civil Disobedience*, “All men reserve the right to revolution; that is the right to refuse allegiance to and to resist the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable. But almost all say that such is not the case now.” Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience and other Essays: Civil Disobedience (1849)*. Dover Publications, NY, 1993. Pg. 3

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* Pg. 17. While it is not recorded if Thoreau and John C. Calhoun ever met, their opposite ideals on the issue of slavery made them adversaries on the issue. Also *Civil Disobedience* was published just ad the revolutions began to fail in Europe. Thoreau’s work is later dissected in Calhoun’s own book *Disquisition on Government* in 1852.

⁹⁶ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pg. 80-2. Titles of some of the plays Roberts notes: *The Last of Kings and the Insurrection of Paris, or, the People’s Triumph* and after the June barricade incident *The Destruction of the Bastille, or, Terror’s Reign* and later in the year the operatic production of *the Barricades*.

of insurrection. Much as Calhoun had disagreed with the *Amistad* case which validated the insurrection of slaves as legal and moral. Thoreau notes a key point in *Civil Disobedience* that is obviously included after his first speech in 1848. This point covers the understanding of how a state can become truly free, not just a democratic State but a State that responds to the all of its citizens. Without that symbiotic response and concern for the true welfare and freedom for all of a State's populace, then that State could truly call itself a nation that pursues the ideals of liberty and freedom. Thoreau writes:

There will never be a really free and enlightened State, until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly.⁹⁷

Thoreau's assurances however do not mesh with Calhoun's political theory at this point, it is actually one of the few points to which they agree on anything. Calhoun makes it clear three years later in *Disquisition on Government*⁹⁸ when he argues that any revolutions in ineffectually undertaken will not only usher in misery and "anarchy" but ranks with the erroneous political ideology of Dorrism.⁹⁹

Emerson one of the key thinkers of the day, wrote heavily on the struggles of man and American's moral destiny; furthermore, Reynolds gives Emerson some of the credit for inadvertently contributing to origins and continuation of the European revolutions, even though Emerson himself was a skeptic of the whole revolutions in general. How this played out was a response to lectures Emerson was giving in Europe, mostly France and Britain at the time of this outbreak of revolutionary ideals. Emerson apologized for American subjectivism in history

⁹⁷ Henry David Thoreau, *Civil Disobedience and other Essays: Civil Disobedience* (1849). Dover Publications, NY, 1993. Pg. 18

⁹⁸ John M. Anderson, ed., *Calhoun: Basic Documents: Disquisition on Government* (1851). Bald Eagle Press, PA, 1952. Pg. 230- 63.

⁹⁹ Ibid. pg. 239. Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pg. 339. Dorrism refers to the rebellion in Massachusetts in 1842 when Thomas Dorr's bid for governor failed and his supporters revolted against the local government in what they felt was a corrupt political system. Massachusetts was the only state that had not rewritten its original colonial charter or constitution since the revolutionary war of 1776. Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Edited by R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds. Oxford, New York 2000. Pg.162.

especially when concerned France first attempted to become a democracy in 1789.¹⁰⁰ This innocent forgiveness by Emerson's part helped foster in the minds of several famous professors at the College de France who later became revolutionaries in 1848: Jules Michelet, Edgar Quinet, and Adam Mickiewicz. The assembled professors were great followers of Emerson's earlier works and took to heart the construction nature of his talks and lectures. It seems that this 'hero worship' may have been one of the catalysts in the later revolutions in France.¹⁰¹ Emerson later pens in his journal an interesting poetic phrase. "Revolution is – lord of the visionary eye whose lid, Once raised, remains aghast, & will not fall."¹⁰²

Calhoun himself was lambasted by a score of authors, poets and radicals who address the revolutions in Europe from all quarters for his objections. A poet James Russell Lowell targeted Calhoun in his *Biglow Paper* No. V, and satirized him in black slave speak:

Jest look wut is doin', wut annkky's brewin'
 In the beautiful clime o' the olive an' vine,
 All the wise aristoxys atumblin' to ruin,
 An' the sankylots drorin' an' drikin' their wine'
 Sez John C Calhoun sez he;
 "Yes," sez Johnson, "in France
 They're beginnin' to dance
 Beelzebub's own rigadoon," sez he.¹⁰³

Calhoun's views on slavery polarized him against the revolutions in Europe and gain him even further notoriety with the abolitionists and anti-slavery presses.

Author Timothy M. Roberts, wrote in his dissertation *The American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848* and his essay *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*¹⁰⁴ a theory that America actually felt and experienced a significant cultural response to those revolutions so far away. Roberts and Reynolds's theories and evidence draws attention to

¹⁰⁰ Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1988. Pg. 4.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. 5.

¹⁰² Ibid. pg. 44. Excerpted from Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Emerson, journal Entry (August 1849): *Wordsworth*, "Dion". Pgs. 92-3.

¹⁰³ Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1988. Pg. 17. The Biglow Paper no. V.; The Debate In The Sennit.

¹⁰⁴ Timothy M. Roberts, *The American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848*. Oxford, NY, 1998. Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Edited by R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann. Oxford, New York 2000. Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Edited by Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002.

an American response outside of the political and is important to show that these concurrent responses triggered by American citizens and immigrants played a part in these cultural responses. A main point he makes is the attitudes of American immigrants responding to the news of the revolutions in Europe.¹⁰⁵ This is one of the few instances where an American perspective is introduced and analyzed in regard to the European revolutions. He showcases how the revolutions were received in America in a somewhat typical fashion of early America; hence, enthusiasms for the revolutions were noticed in demonstrations in a number of east coast cities, including a “great demonstration” (as it was called) in New York in April 1848.¹⁰⁶ This demonstration was rumored to have several thousand in attendance but the *New York Herald* did not do an actual head count at the time.¹⁰⁷ Supporters, immigrants, and pundits of the revolutions gathered near the docks to participate in songs and speeches.

The ‘great demonstration’¹⁰⁸ was held at the New York City hall park. Lyrics from a rally song, written by McFarren brothers seemed to be written just for this occasion. They praise the revolutionaries in the verses offering American solidarity and support:

(First vocal)
 Freedom’s sons! Shall still be free
 Tyrants all, yes all shall bend the knee;
 Freedom’s sons! Freedom’s sons,
 Heaven again with victory, victory, victory;
 Hath Patriots requited,
 Hath Patriots requited,
 Hath Patriots requited!

(2nd, 3rd & 4th vocals in harmony)
 Freedom’s sons! Rejoice with me...rejoice!
 France hath struck for Liberty:
 Freedom’s sons, Freedom’s sons.
 Boast we are country’s sympathy, sympathy, sympathy;

¹⁰⁵ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pg. 76. “[F]resh from war with Mexico, immigrants felt the pangs of their brothers and sisters so far away. They agonized and rejoiced with them when their trails were successful and felt a great sense of grief when all the revolutions ultimately failed.”

¹⁰⁶ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Edited by R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds. Oxford, New York 2000. Pg 165.

¹⁰⁷ *New York Herald*. April 10-15, 1948.

¹⁰⁸ Roberts, Timothy M. *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Edited by R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann. Oxford, New York 2000. Pg. 165.

With those whose wrongs are righted,
With those whose wrongs are righted,
With those whose wrongs are righted!
(All vocals) With those whose wrongs are righted!¹⁰⁹

Looking at the stanzas, it is plain to see that support for the French revolutionaries was becoming popular in mainstream America in April 1848. This song one of the few that has been recovered also illustrates the level of the individuals caught up in the revolutionary craze. It also gives some credence to Namier's theory that the revolutions were full of intellectuals. It is important to point out that this American intellectual response written not for other intellectuals but the common worker, shop owner, or laborer not for the wealthy or elite intellectuals to which Namier attributes the formation of the revolutions to. These rallies of workmen, poets, authors, recent immigrants, housewives, and just the common man notes the undercurrent of support in the U.S. over the revolutions in France and other areas in Europe. These rallies were mostly contained in the northern states with large immigrant populations, also spawned a couple in southern cities that celebrated the seeming triumph of the French people: St. Louis, Missouri and New Orleans, Louisiana.¹¹⁰

In Italy in 1849, American sculptor Hiram Powers, arrived with his statue called 'America'. This statue symbolizes with the plight of Italy and her revolution and if the Italians just follow America's example then their righteous struggle will succeed. Italian art critic Pietro Ferrigni, misinterpreted Powers message, reading the statue as a iconic figure, "an image of Italy trampling on her chains."¹¹¹

Roberts believes that the American authors and poets reacting to the revolutions in the U.S. were sounding the warning bells on the defects they saw in American society. Their dire warnings of "revolutionary" are "what awaited the United States if inequities went

¹⁰⁹ G.A. McFarren, *All Freeman are United*. New York: C. Holt, Jr., 1848. Pgs. 2-8.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* Pg. 1. Cover sheet.

¹¹¹ Paola Gemme, *Domesticating Foreign Struggles: the Italian Risorgimento and antebellum American identity*. University of Georgia, GA, 2005. Pgs. 34-35.

unattended.”¹¹² Roberts noted that if Washington did not heed critics of the revolutions than only dire consequences could result from it. Marxist theory was just beginning to take hold in Europe and began to traverse the Atlantic and arrived on U.S. shores, just like everything else from Europe did. Including failed revolutionary Lajos Kossuth.

Kossuth, a Hungarian minister in the diet for a number of years became a key figure of the Magyar (Hungarian) revolution against the Austrian empire. Conflict after conflict the revolutionaries were successful, but time took its toll and the Hungarian revolt finally failed, crushed by Russian forces on August 11th, 1849.¹¹³ Kossuth shares his grateful thought on the American exile by quoting that his death and the burial of his “bones” on American soil while not Hungary would satisfy his soul.¹¹⁴ In Dec. 4th 1851, Kossuth was welcomed at New York harbor, after a long year spent in England when Daniel Webster, now Secretary of State grants him an official allowance to immigrate to the U.S. The City commissioners of New York, organized a special reception for Governor Kossuth, and a ‘triumphant march’ in his honor. A great military showing was prepared for the greatest Hungarian patriot that included: a military naval escort, salvos from American frigates, and four battalions of troops to carry him in a parade to the New York City hall. Kossuth also conducted a whirlwind speaking and fundraising tour across the United States, gathering money and support for the restoration of Hungarian independence.¹¹⁵ Roberts’s description of Kossuth labels him as a lawyer not a member of the Hungarian Diet, their parliamentary representation to the Austrian empire. Kossuth’s request for aid falls upon deaf ears in Washington D.C., but during his speaking engagements he asks for

¹¹² Ibid. Pg. 86.

¹¹³ Endre Sebestyen, *Kossuth: a Magyar Apostle of World Democracy*. Pittsburgh, PA, 1950. Pg. 63.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. Pg. 68. “It is the free soil of North America where I would sleep the sleep of eternal rest, if my bones are not allowed to mingle with the dust of my homeland.

¹¹⁵ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pgs. 93. “Many European revolutionary refugees came to America, some to settle permanently, others to raise funds to rejoin the struggle in Europe. Of the latter type, the most celebrated was the Hungarian lawyer Lajos Kossuth, whose 1852 speaking and fund- raising tour was sensational if quixotic. Kossuth pleaded for both private financial support for the Hungarian struggle, which he received, and military intervention in Europe, which he was refused. Kossuth spent most of the money he raised before he left the United States.”

“one dollar” from each homestead. With such an accumulation of donations he could purchase “two hundred thousand muskets”¹¹⁶ and bring democracy back to Hungary. Kossuth was an icon in the principals of democratic independence for Europe, a chance for success after all the failures. A redemption of sorts for the lack of American aid to democracies worldwide. The United States under President Millard Fillmore, felt differently than Kossuth and kept the U.S. to the isolationist policies of the Monroe Doctrine. America did not interfere with European interests and the hope was that the European empires would stay out of American affairs. The legacy of the Monroe Doctrine was a double-edged sword and would not be adequately questioned until World War I. Roberts jovially narrates that while Kossuth may have had no real contribution to the American political response; nevertheless, Kossuth himself did leave an indelible fashion trend in his wake as "Kossuth" hats, cloaks, and, for men, beards, became popular.¹¹⁷

American poet William Wetmore Story’s poem “Giannone”¹¹⁸ lambasted the Italian male as a coward and a fool. Penned in 1849 after the restoration of Papal control of Italy, Story sought out to capture the failed revolution in a poem. “Giannone” classic verses echo Story’s disdain with the Italians and their resolve to be free:

Giannone kept drinking...
till at last his tongue had lost its rein,
And all the fire has gone into his brain.
So he began to talk quite wild,
And spoke all his thoughts out like a child,
And names he called, and his voice was high,
As he talked of Italian liberty!
And cursed the priests as the root of all evil.
And sent the Cardinals all to the devil!
... Better dig with the bayonet’s point our graves,
And die to be freeman, than to live as slaves!
Ah, fight we will! There is nothing good,

¹¹⁶ Endre Sebestyén, *Kossuth: a Magyar Apostle of World Democracy*. Pittsburgh, PA, 1950. Pg.81.

¹¹⁷ Timothy M. Roberts, *The American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848*. Oxford, NY, 1998. Pgs. 90-3.

¹¹⁸ Paola Gemme, *Domesticating Foreign Struggles: the Italian Risorgimento and antebellum American identity*. University of Georgia, GA, 2005. Pg. 46.

Which must not be first baptized in blood.¹¹⁹

Giannone is referred to as a child, a coward, and a false patriot, an 'intellectual' that is more concerned with styles and fashion than the plight of the impoverished worker or the rights of the peasants that were being crushed underfoot. His bravado comes from a long night of drinking, and stimulates his courage to rouse his voice against the establishment. He never raises arms against the government though preferring to antagonize and instigate from the sidelines. Story while a resident of Italy echoed statements that others felt especially in the American government and within Thoreau and Emerson's social circles.

Conclusion:

It is imperative to understand that the effects of the European revolutions of 1848-49, caused significant responses from the American political structure, cultural leaders, and the everyday man. As the articles and references detailed here clearly bring to light, these political and cultural responses were important to the United States. Moreover, most of these responses were of a positive nature, though some were cautious or unreceptive, but all addressed the plights and sufferings of the European revolutionaries.

Additionally of acute importance were the difficulties that the American political hierarchy faced as they reexamined the concepts and practicality of the Monroe Doctrine, and their isolationist position. This foreign policy doctrine while still in its infancy, helped shape the determination and will of the American people in the nineteenth century. It also hindered the U.S. in becoming a principal player in the declining world of European imperialism.

Calhoun is characterized as one of the strongest supporters of the Monroe Doctrine as he articulates his arguments on the revolutions and the issue of slavery.¹²⁰ Calhoun repeatedly fixed the image of the revolutions being a harbinger, challenging the presence of slavery and also the

¹¹⁹ Ibid. pg. 46.

¹²⁰ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pgs. 198-9.

fragile aspect of American preeminence in the western hemisphere¹²¹. Calhoun continued his disdain for the revolutionaries and their plight on the grounds that they had no legal right to raise an insurrection,¹²² an idea contrary to the majority of American politicians. In Calhoun's defense, he made his reservations based upon the fact that French revolutionaries had not first drawn up any adequate plans to address how the new government would operate or care for all the people.

To Calhoun, slavery was an inherent right of the south and a platform that he defended vigorously. He also understood that even slaves must be treated well and needed to be cared for by their owners, just as a government must look after the welfare of its people¹²³. Because such a facet of the revolutionaries plan was lacking, Calhoun could not support a government that condemned its people to a similar fate.

It was not just Calhoun and Clay against Webster, Dallas, and Polk that began a seemingly 'civil war' in the hallowed halls of the American political scene, but the political reaction to what was transpiring in Europe underpinned the American angst of its own inner turmoil. While a revolution of the masses in the U.S. was unlikely,¹²⁴ the thought of an American Civil War loomed in everyone's mind. This threat was punctuated by the Kansas-Nebraska act of 1854. This law sought to offer a solution to the slavery issue; instead it became a line that divided the United States almost right down the middle. It is a clear metaphor stressing the divisions in America, echoed in both her politics and collected culture. The immigrants of Europe, who arrived in 1848 and up to the end of the Civil War, rarely immigrated to the southern states, arriving in droves to Boston, New York, and Philadelphia but not in Raleigh or

¹²¹ Ibid. Pg. 234.

¹²² John M. Anderson, ed., *Calhoun: Basic Documents: Disquisition on Government* (1851). Bald Eagle Press, PA, 1952. Pg. 131.

¹²³ Ibid. Pg. 118.

¹²⁴ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Edited by R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds. Oxford, New York 2000. Pg.162.

With the exception of the 1842 revolt by Thomas Dorr and his followers in Massachusetts over political recognition and participation. It was also one of the very few cases of a political revolt inside the United States during its 230 year history.

Jacksonville.¹²⁵ This polar discrepancy helped bring the failed revolutionaries of Europe and their ideals to the American shores, and to exacerbate the South's feelings of economic disparity.

Calhoun's early prediction of France's regression into an imperial state was accurate, but he was wrong on the successes of the German and Prussian revolutions and their failures. That error may have made him hesitant to predict the fate of the Hungarians even though this revolution in 1848 was more along the lines of Calhoun's doctrine.¹²⁶ In fact Calhoun stayed silent on the issue of Kossuth, neither speaking out for or against Kossuth and his revolutionary ideals. Kossuth and the Magyars actually tried a non-violent revolution at first, a matter of reselecting their government from an authoritarian control to an American style democracy. Calhoun would have noted this, paralleling the fact the Magyars, a minority ethnic group, who were trying to operate as a minority party and in the structure of a modern day nation, throwing off the chains of their masters, the 'northern' Austrian empire. Though the Magyars were not the largest minority group in Hungary, their charge to create an independent nation led them to be recognized as the prevailing 'party' for change in Austria-Hungary relations.

At the heart of the American political responses still lay the Monroe Doctrine. Its true intent was to give the U.S. the right to meddle anywhere in the American hemisphere. Hence the Mexican-American war of 1846-47, the Ostend manifesto debacle in 1854, and of course the misguided attempts by American William Walker to overthrow Nicaragua in 1855.¹²⁷ The foundation of the doctrine was the inherent isolationist trait that was imbued in the actions of American politics and her culture, but never sustainable. This lack of sustainability of isolationism is due to the ever encroaching world and international trade that the U.S. was

¹²⁵ Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939. Pg. 70.

¹²⁶ John M. Anderson, ed., *Calhoun: Basic Documents: Disquisition on Government* (1851). Bald Eagle Press, PA, 1952. Pg. 124.

¹²⁷ Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002. Pgs. 81-82. William Walker and fifty-eight mercenaries captured Granada, Nicaragua. He declared himself President of Nicaragua and gained U.S. diplomatic recognition in 1856. Walker and his mercenaries were overthrown in 1857 by Nicaraguan rebels.

becoming involved in. As these factors amplified, the U.S. did not always pull back to its own shores. Such examples can be seen in Commodore Perry's treaty with Japan in 1854, the closer relationship with France in 1868, and the continued American support for Liberia on Africa's west coast.

The failure of the revolutions in Europe can partially be attributed to the systematic observance policies of the U.S. Government and its repeated bifurcated mentality towards the plight of Europe. The U.S. never took a definitive stand but straddled the fence, much like Kossuth did. Even Calhoun who supported the more democratic revolution in the German confederacy, opposed the French attempts, and remained silent of the Hungarian and Italian revolutions.¹²⁸ The next three U.S. administrations all differed on the proper course of action toward the revolutionaries, while the main political actors simply shifted in their roles (Buchanan and Webster) and some acted on their own behalf (Rush and Buchanan). No constant American policy was adopted with regards to all of the revolutions. The failure of the revolutions themselves is in fact a resulting failure of the 'intellectuals', namely the American politicians, and of the Monroe Doctrine.

One possible outcome of an interactive response to the revolutions with direct American action may have been a forestalling of later political troubles and even wars with Europe, leading up to World War I. Only an oracle could foretell the true ramifications of a U.S. involvement outside the actions that it did take or where they would have led. What is known is the course of history that follows after the revolutions in Europe fail, especially without the aid of a democratic nation such as the U.S. failing to support the cause of liberty in Europe. The failures of the revolutions were also due to the lack of a cohesive strategy by the separate revolutionary groups to address what happens after they overthrew the legitimate governments. After that

¹²⁸ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951. Pgs 185-215.

failure in Europe the United States also suffered with the Civil War in 1861-65 and the Spanish-American War of 1898. Europe also remaining years of the nineteenth century, undergoes another round of revolutions (the 1860s); furthermore the incorporations of empires and territories amid new violence and several small wars led to World War I in 1914. To which the Monroe Doctrine is finally put aside as the U.S. understands that the world is smaller than it first believed and what happened in Europe truly became what happened in the United States.

American essayists, poets, songwriters, common people, and even government officials went out of their way to detail their involvement, observations, support or dissent of the revolutions raging through Europe. While Roberts examined how immigrants and Americans reacted to these events, he gave a resplendent overview. Roberts looked at the various American political, economic, cultural, and social reactions to the revolutions in Europe. Reinhold looked at the refugee factor of the time, but it was part of a larger work and did not delve too deeply on that particular period, and also it showcased partially the reasons behind the new waves of European immigrants.

Reynolds brought to life a number of literary responses in his collection of evidence from the period. He stressed the importance of the event and how it affected American literary artists of the period: Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and William Story. Other historians like Gallagher, Rohr, and Elazar investigated the political side of the revolutions and but also larger issues in American foreign relations of the 1800s.

All of the elements of history played out when looking at the American reactions to the European revolutions and not just based upon the evidence in political and cultural sources. These elements increase the importance of studying not only the European revolutions of 1848-49 in greater detail but also to reexamine the American perspective on these revolutions. Like a

stone thrown into a pond, the ripples of revolution crossed the Atlantic and found themselves in the primary and secondary sources of the United States literature, and interwoven into the stories and history of the day. It becomes necessary to readdress the American and European history of 1848 until 1865, and approach that period of history with a more critical eye. The issues of slavery, emancipation, and the inherent freedoms of the American people are all factors of those American response, whether overt or subtle, that were made regarding the revolutions, had a categorical influence on the future of American politics and its culture. That influence has helped shape America into the nation that it is today.

Later those same newly free French citizens in 1868 gifted America with the most unique bastion of liberty ever constructed; renown the world over as the single greatest symbol of freedom and democracy that was ever crafted: The Statue of Liberty. This great icon resides in that same New York harbor that had celebrated Kossuth and Garibaldi arrival years before, inscribed in 1893 with the fundamental truth that illustrates of the importance of the American response to the European revolutions. Its poetic statement still reads:

“Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”¹²⁹

Bibliography

Peter H. Amann, “Writings of the Second French Republic.” *Journal of Modern History*. Vol. 34, No. 4, December 1962. Pgs. 409-429.

Amistad. Directed by Steven Spielsburg. 1 hour and 48 minutes. Produced by DreamWorks, CA, 1997.

John M. Anderson, ed., *Calhoun: Basic Documents: Disquisition on Government* (1851). Bald Eagle Press, PA, 1952.

Ivan T. Berend, ed., *History Derailed: Central and Eastern European in the Long Nineteenth Century*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 2003

Brooker T. Calhoun, *Speech on the reception of Abolition Petitions John C. Calhoun*. Essential Speeches, Great Neck Publishing, 2003. Speech 9.0

¹²⁹ Lazarus, Emma. *The New Colossus*. 1893. Inscription on the Statue of Liberty’s plaque.

Eugene N. Curtis, *The American Historical Review: American Opinion of the French Nineteenth-Centuries Revolutions*. Vol. 29, No. 2 (Jan., 1924), pp. 249-270.

Eugene Delacroix, *Liberty Leading The People*. Painting. July 28 1830.

Daniel Judah Elazar, *Covenant and Civil Society: the Constitutional Matrix of a Modern Democracy*. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction, c1998.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The Best of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Essays, Poems, Addresses: Voluntaries(1863)*. Walter Black, NY, 1941.

R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds., *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. Oxford, New York 2000.

John G. Gallaher, *An Evaluation of the Revolution of 1848 by American Diplomats*. St. Louis University press, St. Louis, 1961.

Paola Gemme, *Domesticating Foreign Struggles: the Italian Risorgimento and antebellum American identity*. University of Georgia, GA, 2005.

U.S. Congress. *Journal of the Senate of the United States of America: 1789-1873*. April 24, 1848.

Emma Lazarus, *The New Colossus*. 1893

Le Amistad v. United States of America 40.US.518.1841

G.A. McFarren, *All Freeman are United*. New York: C. Holt, Jr., 1848.

Melvin Kranzberg, *1848 A Turning Point?* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston 1959

Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of Intellectuals*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K. 1946, 1971, 1992.

New York Herald. April 15, 1948.

“The revolutions in Europe.” *North American Review*. Volume 67, Issue 140, July 1948. Pgs. 194-240.

Frances L. Reinhold, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences: Exiles and Refugees in American History*. Vol. 203, May 1939.

Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 1988.

Jasper Ridley, *Garibaldi*. Constable, London, 1974.

Timothy M. Roberts, *The American Response to the European Revolutions of 1848*. Oxford, NY, 1998.

Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. 2000. In *The Revolutions in Europe: 1848 – 1849, From Reform to Reaction*. R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann eds. Oxford, New York 2000.

Timothy M. Roberts, *United States and the European Revolutions of 1848*. In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. Guy Thomson. Institute of Latin American Studies, London, 2002.

Richard C. Rohrs, “American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848.” *Journal of the Early Republic*. Vol. 14, No. 3. Autumn 1994. Pgs 359-377.

Endre Sebestyen, *Kossuth: a Magyar Apostle of World Democracy*. Pittsburgh, PA, 1950.

Henry Smales, “French Revolution: M. Louis Blanc.” *American Whig Review*. Volume 8, Issue 1, July 1848.

Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848 – 1851*. Cambridge University Press 1994.

Henry David Thoreau, *Civil Disobedience and other Essays: Civil Disobedience (1849)*. Dover Publications, NY, 1993.

Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850: Slavery and World Revolution*. Russell & Russell, NY, 1951.

Charles M. Wiltse, "A Critical Southerner: John C. Calhoun on the Revolutions of 1848." *The Journal of Southern History*. Southern Historical Association, 1949.